

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/805,069	VERSCHUUR ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Daniel A. Hess	2876	

All Participants:

 (1) Daniel A. Hess.

 (2) Mr. Thomas Ryan.
Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 2 February 2006
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

112 and 103 rejections

Claims discussed:

1-36, 142 and 143

Prior art documents discussed:

Verschuur et al. (6,202,929)
Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet
Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

DANIEL STCYR
PRIMARY EXAMINER

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner explained his position as follows: Verschuur et al. (US 6,202,929) has patterns that are designed to vary from one article to the next. How can one distinguish whether Verschuur is 'effectively random'? Perhaps it is. Perhaps it isn't. Without a specific definition in the claim of how the effective randomness is achieved, one is unable to answer this question, and is thus unable to ascertain patentability. Hence an indefiniteness rejection was made.

Also, a certain amount of drifting from side to side can be expected in any web. Since the Applicant has included this in his definition of 'effectively random' any web will have a certain amount of effective randomness. Claim 1 at least was therefore deemed too broad.

The applicant and the Examiner agreed that the language "patterns are formed by one or more in-line processes that are not repeated in registration with the succession of printable articles; and the in-line processes include printing out of registration with the succession of printable articles" overcomes this issue by giving more specific meaning to the words 'effectively random'.